DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 261 HE 009 164

TITLE A Survey of College Retention and Attrition in the Princeton Cooperative School Prcgram (Upward Bound) 1966-1975.
INSTITUTION Princeton Univ., N.J.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 107p.; Princeton Cocperative School Program

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability; *Academic Achievement; *Attrition (Research Studies); Disadvantaged Youth; *Federal Programs; *Higher Education; High School Graduates; Low Income; *School Holding Power; Students
IDENTIFIERS *Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

The Princeton Cooperative School Program was part of the federally funded and spcnsored Upward Bound Program designed to aid the disadvantaged poor and the low-income student to successfully complete high school and enter college. The ccllege retention and attrition for each of the graduating classes during the years 1966 to 1975 are compared to national norms for low-income students. The college graduate rate for each class of PCSP students during this period compares favorably with national figures. Some discussion is offered regarding the type cf social, emotional, and academic problems of each class as well as the problems in attempting to follow up former students; 66 of the 200 Upward Bound students (33 percent) who graduated from high school between 1969 and 1973 cannot be located. Overall the program is seen as successfully assisting high-potential low-income students. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143261

A SURVEY OF COLLEGE RETENTION AND ATTRITION

IN THE

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM (UPWARD BOUND)

1966 - 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE009164

Princeton Cooperative School Program
204 Green Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Earl P. Thomas, Director

March, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Part One: Higher Education for the Disadvantaged

The Development of Compensatory Programs..... 1

College Retention and Attrition: A National Overview..... 7

Part Two: The Princeton Cooperative School Program, 1966 - 1975

Follow-Up of Former Students..... 10

College Retention and Attrition 1966-1970..... 11

College Retention and Attrition 1971-1972..... 12

College Retention and Attrition 1973-1974..... 15

Reasons PCSP students Withdrew from College..... 15

Employed Former Students..... 16

Summary and Conclusions..... 17

Tables

Table I: Student Persistence and Attrition in College 1966 - 1976..... 19

Table II: Students Who Withdrew from College..... 20

Table III: Number of Respondents by Class..... 21

Footnotes..... 22

Bibliography..... 23

Appendix..... A-1

PART ONE

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS

Between 1960 and 1966, national attention was focused on the disproportionately low numbers of minority students enrolled in higher education. The size and scope of the problem, as well as recommendations for change, were explored in several conferences and symposiums. One of these meetings, The Research Conference on Education and Cultural Deprivation, was particularly significant: its participants were among the finest thinkers in education and the social sciences.

The conference was held at the University of Chicago, June 8-12, 1964. One of the major recommendations for adolescent education was that:

> "A major effort must be made to identify, by the beginning of secondary education, a sizeable group of deprived students who can with appropriate continual effort on the part of the school be enabled to complete secondary education successfully and begin higher education. These students must be offered special instructional programs, tutorial help as needed, increased counseling, and help on the basic skills and tool subjects."[1]

Increasing the number of disadvantaged students who were accepted and enrolled in higher education became an educational priority. The initial results from a few privately financed compensatory education programs were encouraging, and in 1965 the Federal government formally accepted some responsibility for the higher education of the disadvantaged by funding a nationwide program called Upward Bound.

Upward Bound provided funds to host institutions, usually two to four year colleges and universities, to tutor and counsel disadvantaged high school youths. Funded institutions were to conduct intensive, college preparatory sessions during the summers before and after the students' high school graduation. College admissions counseling was to be a major focus of Upward Bound services to students because the program's major goal was to enlarge the pool of qualified low-income candidates for higher education. It is only fair to mention that this latter point was disputed circa 1970 by a number of project leaders who maintained that at the outset, Upward Bound's major goal had been to increase the number of students graduating high school. Project administrators continue to argue this question although the matter is purely academic at this point. What is important is that the administration at most funded institutions and the project leaders they chose to manage the programs intended that Upward Bound become a resource for the college bound student that went beyond increasing the number of high school graduates.

The Federal guidelines that were issued to regulate the new programs did not specify that the programs were for blacks or any other ethnic minority. The emphasis was on serving the disadvantaged poor, the low-income student. However, the fact that an unusually large number of blacks were classified in low-income groups and an unusually small number of blacks were enrolling in college each year did result in a slight black majority among participating students.

In 1965 black college students were only 4.2 percent of all black students between the ages of 5 and 34. The number of white students between the ages of 5 and 34 who were in college that same year was approximately

11.5 percent.[2] The striking disparity between the college attendance rates for blacks and whites underscored the magnitude of the problem. Some educators and social scientists called the statistics the shame of our nation and insisted that higher education practices were exclusionary and needed immediate revision. Others felt the statistics did indicate a problem, but that the core of the matter was unqualified and undereducated minorities rather than college admissions practices. Somewhere between these two extremes was yet a third group who took the position that there were a significant number of capable minority students who did not have access to higher education and that these students should be the focus of an ambitious recruitment campaign.

By 1968 the number of black college students had increased to 6% of all black students between the ages of 5 and 34.[3] More black students were being admitted to predominantly white institutions, but these minimal gains were too often the result of bitter and hard fought conflicts between advocates of equal educational opportunity and traditional college admissions personnel.

One important factor that should be considered is the moral climate that existed in the country between 1964 and 1968. Americans were exhorted to embrace a social consciousness and act out of a strong sense of social responsibility in regard to minorities and the poor. The appeal was directed at the humanistic core that was presumed to underly the American value system: the Judeo-Christian ethic. President Johnson, the chief architect of the new movement, provided the moral leadership; the Congress provided the money. The private sector was called upon to meet some portion of the national social obligation, and to help upgrade the economic condition of

the poor through employment and training programs. Taken together, these efforts resulted in some noteworthy successes.

It should also be noted that the social unrest that occurred in the late 1960s did, among other things, focus the nation on the plight of minorities and the poor. The Congress reacted by simultaneously pouring additional funds into social programs and state law enforcement agencies.

At the state level, 1968 was the year that New Jersey implemented the Equal Opportunity Program in higher education. The availability of state sponsored financial support for low-income students in conjunction with Federal level grants and loans did much to help poor students overcome one of the most formidable barriers to higher education: the lack of money with which to meet college costs.

Upward Bound was also growing, but not at a rate proportional to the need for the services the programs offered. In 1969 there were 23,000 students enrolled in Upward Bound programs at nearly 300 colleges and universities, but this figure accounted for less than 5 percent of all eligible students.[4] The program models were very diverse: they varied according to the character and atmosphere at the host institutions that sponsored them, ethnic and cultural differences in their student populations, and special factors unique to the geographical regions where they were located.

Upward Bound was in its infancy in 1969 and diversity in program design was considered a major strength. Regional, cultural, ethnic urban-rural differences, could not be ignored; nor could the effects these factors generated through their influence on adolescent intellectual and psychological development. The 16 year old teenager in Skokie, Illinois

was distinctly different from his New York City or metropolitan New Jersey counterpart: each was the product of a specific experiential pattern.

The danger in diversity was that it could easily become a millstone if the programs remained part of an administrative structure that lacked the capacity to provide technical assistance, conduct in-depth evaluations of programs, identify effective methods and techniques, and replicate successful models. None of these services were provided. Upward Bound was financially hamstrung from its inception and in 1969 the dollars simply were not available for items like in-depth program evaluation, dissemination of data, and replication; they were earmarked for services to a small segment of the eligible student population that in size, amounted to no more than the tip of the iceberg. Numbers were what counted, so the dollars were stretched to serve the maximum number of students.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, the Federal agency that housed Upward Bound, estimated in 1970 that approximately 70 to 80 percent of Upward Bound's graduates were entering higher education. While there is no question that many students gained their acceptance to college as a result of the efforts of sympathetic administrators who were being hired in increasing numbers by colleges and universities, the placement results were impressive. Even if one concedes that some margin of error was present, that perhaps only 50 to 60 percent of Upward Bound graduates had entered college, the figures were still of considerable significance. They indicated that a segment of the traditionally undereducated, low-income population had begun to have greater access to higher education.

Low-income students, i.e., dependent persons from families with incomes of less than $10,000 per year, have traditionally found access to

higher education difficult to attain. By 1974 low-income blacks and whites were attending college in more equal proportions. Approximately 20 percent of the low-income population of each racial group were in college. If this statistic is taken at face value, it suggests that some form of racial parity in low-income college enrollment had been achieved, when in fact enrollments continued to be disequal. In 1974 only 16 percent of the 18 to 24 year old white students who were dependent family members were from families whose income was less than $10,000 per year, whereas, a staggering 64 percent of their black counterparts were members of the same low-income group.[5] Since almost two-thirds of all college age blacks are from low-income families, there will have to be a dramatic upward shift in the percentage of students from this group who enroll in college before any real parity can be achieved.

The lower income distribution of black students provides ample evidence of the need for special programs for the low-income and disadvantaged student at the secondary and higher education level. The children of the poor generally attend secondary schools of poor quality. When the majority of poor children leave school after 12 years of formal education they are usually ill prepared for entering the work force or post secondary education. Since the inception of Upward Bound the quality of public education in general has deteriorated rather than improved. The urban minority poor in particular have been the hardest hit by this downward trend and the recent Federal and State level emphasis on meeting the needs of the underskilled middle class student threatens to deprive the already disadvantaged student even more.

Another significant fact is the reality that Federal appropriations for Upward Bound and other Special Programs for the Disadvantaged have remained at the same dollar figure for over three years. Inflation and increased costs

have, each year, continually eroded the actual dollar value of the Special Programs appropriation. For all intents and purposes the programs have been in a no-growth pattern for some time and it is more than likely that this trend will continue.

In 1975-1976, there were 46,000 students enrolled in the 400 operational Upward Bound projects.[6] If these figures are compared to the 23,000 students and 300 active projects of 1969, there would appear to have been considerable growth in both the number of funded projects and enrolled students. Upward Bound as a nationwide program has grown in relation to its former size. Upward Bound has not grown, however, in relation to the proportion of the eligible high potential target population to whom services are extended. The most conservative estimates indicate that projects are still serving less than 5 percent of all income eligible high potential students.[7]

COLLEGE RETENTION AND ATTRITION: A NATIONAL OVERVIEW

College retention and attrition has been a major concern to Upward Bound staff since the first group of project graduates entered college nearly 8 to 10 years ago. College became the proving ground for each project. It was expected that if program staff had done their jobs properly, a significant number of former students would persist and eventually graduate from college. The big question, however, was exactly what constituted a significant number.

Degree completion (retention) rates appear to have remained amazingly consistent over the past 40 years. Studies by McNeely (1938), and Iffert (1957); reports by Panos and Astin (1968), Astin (1972), and Bayer and others (1973); as well as reviews of the literature by Summerskill (1962) and

Skaling (1971) indicate that 50 to 60 percent of all students who enter college earn baccalaureate degrees.[8] Most estimates appear to cluster around 50 percent as a national average, and it is this statistic that has often been used for comparison with Upward Bound.

It is around this latter point that there has been a great deal of discussion and dissension. One side argues that the program should match or surpass the national average for all students in college retention. The other side maintains that low-income Upward Bound students should not be compared to middle and high income college students, and that the program should use retention statistics on only low-income college students as a basis for comparison. To do otherwise would be to ignore what is perhaps the most significant factor in college retention: socio-economic status.

Among others, Folger (1970) has estimated that approximately 30 percent of the entering freshmen from the two lowest socio-economic groups (approximate earnings of less than $10,000 per year) eventually graduate from college.[9] His figure would seem to be a more appropriate basis of comparison than a national average that includes all socio-economic groups.

Socio-economic status generally correlates very highly with college graduation, but there are indications that family income per se may not be the most important factor in the individual's socio-economic classification. Increasing attention is being given to some of the other factors that appear to be most often related to income, such as parental educational level. What is perhaps even more important is that parental educational level may itself mask the most critical variable: the nurturing and motivational climate within the home that forms the commitment to educational achievement. The family that is secure in its ability to provide its members with adequate food,

clothing, and shelter on both an immediate and long term basis is better able to ensure a positive environment: the internal stress factors are lessened. Conversely, the family that is financially insecure and has difficulty in providing the basic necessities for its members is theoretically prone to greater internal tension and limited in terms of the degree to which it can ensure a positive environment. External economic forces tend to have a more damaging effect on the disadvantaged family and its members.

The disadvantaged student, more often than not, enters higher education somewhat scared by his experiences and hampered by a low quality educational background. Compensatory programs can make up for a school system's educational shortcomings in relatively short order; eliminating the negative influences of a disadvantaged environment is another thing altogether. If only for these reasons, it is unlikely that the disadvantaged student could persist in college as well as his middle class counterpart, and unrealistic of social scientists and educators to expect that the act of entering college is, by itself, sufficient to eliminate prior disadvantagement.

Another aspect of college attrition that merits examination is the matter of why students leave college. There is considerable evidence to show that lack of money and academic termination may not be the reasons that most students leave school. Dissatisfaction with the institution, marriage, revised career objectives, individual-personal problems, family problems, borderline performance and academic underachievement, are some of the major causes of attrition. In other instances, dropping out and stopping out are positive actions. The student who leaves school in order to think things out or to weigh whether or not he really wants a college education is making an attempt at mature decision making.

PART TWO

THE PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
1966 - 1975

FOLLOW-UP OF FORMER STUDENTS

The Princeton Cooperative School Program has attempted to monitor the progress of its former students since 1969. In January of each year, questionnaires were sent to the registrars at colleges where our former students had originally enrolled or, according to our records, were still in attendance. Questionnaires were also sent to the last known addresses of former students who did not enroll in college immediately after graduation, who enrolled in college and later withdrew, and who enrolled in college and were later dismissed. The college level follow-up worked well as long as the student remained in the school where he originally matriculated, or we were aware of a transfer to another institution. If a student changed his home address and we did not know where he had moved, our contact was broken. A significant number of our former students did let us know if they had moved, but they were generally the more successful students and not the transfers, stopouts, and dropouts we needed to continue to follow-up.

A small number of former students have been located by staff contacts with an informal grapevine of project graduates, but even here the information has generally been about students who had enjoyed some recent occupational or educational success and whose potential was high at the outset. We have no way of knowing what has happened to a significant number of our students; and although they must be technically counted as never having entered or, in the case of withdrawals, never having reentered college, we, in fact, do not know if this is true. For example, of the 34 Upward Bound students who graduated high school in 1971 we have not been able to contact 14 for over 2 years. In the class that graduated high school in 1972, 15 of 44 living Upward Bound students have not been heard from for 2 or more years. If a

mere 25 percent of these two classes (six students) have had some significant educational success, it would have an important effect on our disappointing retention statistics for those years.

We are certain that some of these missing students have done well. One clearly observable pattern among PCSP and low-income students in general over the years has been that it may take a period of up to 8 years following high school graduation for a student to make a breakthrough and experience some educational or occupational success. We can not rule out the possibility that the students in question have not been successful, and this may, in fact, be what has occurred. However, we do not know this. We do not even have enough information to hazard an educated guess. In the class of 1970, we have been out of contact for 2 years or more with only 9 (25 percent) of the 36 Upward Bound students who graduated that year. Our college retention and graduation statistics for that year are certainly respectable in comparison to traditional degree completion rates for low-income students, and there could be some relationship between the level of the retention rate and the fact that the whereabouts and activities of most of that student group are known to us.

COLLEGE RETENTION AND ATTRITION, 1966 - 1970

Nearly all of the PCSP students who graduated in 1966, 1967, and 1968 were sponsored by private funds (Rockefeller Foundation) during the time they were active in PCSP. As a group, they tended to fall in the moderate income category, performed at a superior level in program activities, and had a minimum of academic skills problems. They were disadvantaged in terms of their social backgrounds and because personnel in the public schools they

attended had overlooked or ignored their above average ability and potential. Most of them were simply being pushed through the system in general, industrial, and commercial courses: no one suggested to them that they might develop into successful college students. There is no question that they were an exceptionally capable and intelligent group: the rentention-graduation statistics for those years are ample evidence of this. (see Table I, p.19)

The PCSP class that graduated in 1969 was, for all intents and purposes, the first Upward Bound class. Of that group, we know that 53 percent (see Table I) have graduated college or reenrolled to continue their education. We have been unable for 2 or more years, to locate 15 (38.4%) of the 39 high school graduates that year. The graduation-retention statistics are, nonetheless, impressive. The students in this first Upward Bound class were all from low-income families. They too, had been overlooked by insensitive and inept public school personnel, however, the academic skills level of all but a few students in the group was quite good. It was estimated that no more than a half dozen were reading one year or more below grade. One could point to motivational, family, environmental, and financial problems among the students: but their reading ability was good and they did not have any gross writing deficiencies. The class of 1970 had a similar profile: gross skills deficiencies were not typical of the group.

COLLEGE RETENTION AND ATTRITION, 1971 - 1972

Prior to 1969, PCSP recruited students from 12 high schools in 6 communities. Under this arrangement, developing an intense academic year follow-up component as mandated by the Federal government would have proved impossible with our small staff. The need to retrench was obvious, so in

1969 it was decided that the project would remain active in Newark and Trenton and recruit students from 3 schools rather than 12. The students who graduated high school in 1971 and 1972 were the first of the cluster groups from inner city schools. They were unquestionably high risk (but high potential) students who suffered from all of the problems typically associated with poverty and deprivation; and in addition had no choice other than to attend schools where the educational quality was, at best, mediocre.

It was expected that the shift in the recruiting pattern to the particular cluster schools in question would probably affect the college degree completion rate for the new classes. Most staff estimates indicated that a 40 to 45 percent college retention and graduation rate was realistic, but that this was contingent upon the continued personal and academic growth of each student and the degree and quality of services available to that student at the college level. PCSP staff did not feel that the college placement rate would decline. Our students continued to be highly motivated to enter post secondary education and the colleges, if primarily for financial reasons, continued to make spaces available.

It is discouraging to note that five years after graduating high school the class of 1971 has a college retention rate of only 39 percent. The available data on the class of 1972 is equally disappointing, but again, with both of these groups it has been over 2 or more years since we have had any additional information on over one-third of them.

There were indications, prior to high school graduation, that both classes were more seriously disadvantaged than the evidence that was available at the time they were recruited led us to believe. Our policy was to recruit students who were in the middle range in performance and clearly not the most

outstanding students in their respective high schools. This was consistent with U.S. Office of Education policy at the time which was to avoid the practice of creaming. We found it increasingly more difficult to work effectively with students during the academic year once we clustered our participants in Newark and Trenton. More students began to experience conflicts with high school instructors in the classroom and perform sporadically and below their ability level. Gains that were made during the residential summer in self-discipline, motivation, and academic skills, began to gradually erode as the academic year progressed.

Neither Newark nor Trenton were testing basic academic skills in 1969 and 1970, so the only objective evidence of performance that was available at the time consisted of elementary school test results that were approximately 5 years old. We subsequently discovered that grade inflation was rampant at all of the cluster high schools and that grades often had no relationship to ability or performance. A letter grade of B could mean that a student was physically attractive, easy to manage in the classroom, attended class two thirds of the time, or diligently ran all the errands that were requested.

Newark began to test basic academic skills in approximately 1972, and once the initial results were tabulated and the skills levels were found to be abominably low, PCSP as well as other Upward Bound programs had no choice other than to recruit students who were academically stronger. Our previous policy of recruiting the middle range student was valid only in instances where there was a strong correlation between earned letter grades and basic academic skills and where a normal proportion of the student body performed at and above grade level. In situations where disproportionate

numbers of students had serious skills deficiencies, such as urban areas like Newark and Trenton, recruiting in the middle range did not make sense. Projects had only two choices: they either creamed the better students, or recruited those with serious deficiencies and risked falling far short of achieving their program objectives. PCSP students who graduated high school from 1973 to 1976 were generally among the academically stronger students in their respective schools and tended to rank in the upper half of their classes, but they too had some skills deficiencies.

COLLEGE RETENTION AND ATTRITION, 1973 - 1974

College retention rates for the groups that graduated high school in 1973 and 1974 are encouraging. If their good fortune holds, they should both end up with a college degree completion rate of approximately 46%. We are certain there has been some attrition since the survey in this report was conducted, however, we are confident that the number of students from these classes who earn college degrees will be impressive.

REASONS PCSP STUDENTS WITHDREW FROM COLLEGE

As of March, 1976, 142 of the 428 students who entered college since 1966 had withdrawn from school. (see Table II, p.20) We have not had contact with 74 (52%) students in this group since they withdrew from school. We sent follow-up questionnaires to what we knew to be their last known addresses, but over two thirds of them had moved and the remainder chose not to respond to our inquiries. The questionnaires that had been sent to the colleges they had attended were returned to us but did not give

any reasons for the withdrawal. We can assume that in a substantial number of instances the students were in academic difficulty or were terminated, but we have no way of knowing the specific reasons in these 74 cases.

The 68 remaining students did return our questionnaire, and it is interesting to note that only 32 of them (47%) were terminated for poor performance. The other 36 students (53%) who left school were not dropped for academic reasons. There is some evidence that all of the 142 withdrawals had experienced minor academic difficulties at one time or another, but what is significant is that we know at least one fourth of all withdrawals (36/142) were not academic terminations.

EMPLOYED FORMER STUDENTS

At the time of the survey there were 306 students who could be classified as employable. (see Appendix p. A-13) We were able to obtain information on the occupations of 117 of them (41%), knew that 2 were unemployed as of January, 1976, and that another 5 were deceased. Of the 182 students on whom we have no occupational data, approximately 90 (49%) are known college graduates whom we could not locate at the time of the survey. There are 62 college graduates (53%) among the 117 former students whom we know to be employed and they are clustered in occupational classifications I, II, III, IV, and IX (see Appendix p. A-11). The remaining 55 students, who had either been dismissed or had withdrawn from college, were grouped in occupational classifications IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX. (see Appendix p. A-12)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The college graduation rate for each class of PCSP students who graduated high school in 1966, 1967, and 1968, compares favorably with the nationwide average of 50 to 60 percent for students from all income levels. As a group, these students came from moderate income families and tended to have strong academic skills.

Princeton's first Upward Bound class graduated high school in 1969. They were all low-income students with moderate social problems, but very good academic skills. The most distinguishing characteristic about the class of 1970 is that they too, were low-income students who possessed good academic skills. The college graduation rate for these two groups is significantly higher than the 30 percent estimate for low-income students that is generally accepted.

In 1969, the number of high schools where students were recruited was reduced from 12 to 3 and the first class of cluster students graduated high school in 1971. The students in the class of 1971 were more seriously disadvantaged than any of their predecessors. More of them had serious academic skills and social problems, and all of them were enrolled in urban high schools where the educational quality was rapidly declining. The information we have to date on the college graduation rate for these groups is disappointing, but still falls above the national average for low-income students.

The students who graduated high school in 1972 were the most seriously disadvantaged class that had ever been in the program. They were bright students, but suffered from a range of social problems that would

boggle the mind. For example, of the 6 students known to have died since the program began in 1964, 4 of them were from the class of 1972 and 3 of the 4 died violent deaths (1 suicide and 2 unsolved killings). At the time of the survey, some 7 semesters after they entered college, slightly less than 40 percent of the class of 1972 were still enrolled.

After 5 semesters in college, the students who graduated high school in 1973 are doing well. The most significant difference between this group and the classes of 1971 and 1972 is in the nature and degree of social problems that were characteristic of students for any given year. Active drug users, students with serious emotional problems, or a chronic history of serious anti-social behavior were screened out of the recruiting process for the class of 1973 because we felt they were too damaged to reap sufficient benefits from an academically oriented program for college bound students.

One of the major problems in attempting to follow-up former students has been the fallibility of using a system of mailed questionnaires. Our contact with a student is broken is he withdraws from college without leaving a forwarding address or moves from the last known address that we have on file. For example, of the 200 Upward Bound students who graduated high school between 1969 and 1973, we are currently unable to locate 66 (33%) of them (see Table III, p. 21).

On the face of it, our record is good despite a few relatively bleak periods in our history. We could have done better in some areas, however. Part of our failure is attributable to past errors in administrative judgment and another reason we fell short of our expectations was that there were negative social forces operating over which we had no control. We do feel, that in the 12 years PCSP was in operation we have made significant contributions to the pool of information on high potential low-income students and been the most important educational influence in the lives of most of our students.

TABLES

STUDENT PERSISTENCE AND ATTRITION
IN COLLEGE

1966 - 1976

TABLE 1

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM

YEAR GRAD HIGH SCHOOL	NO. STUDENTS IN CLASS	NO. STUDENTS GRAD HIGH SCHOOL	NO. STUDENTS ENT. COLLEGE	NO. STUDENTS REMAINING OR GRAD COLLEGE (1976)	NO. ENT. GRAD. SCHOOL	% STUDENTS ENT. GRAD SCHOOL
1966	39	39	36 (93.3%)	22 (61.11%)	9	25.0 %
1967	38	38	27 (71.1%)	16 (59.26%)	5	18.51%
1968	53	49	43 (87.8%)	24 (55.81%)	9	20.93%
1969	39	38	34 (89.5%)	18 (52.94%)	6	17.64%
1970	38	37	32 (86.5%)	15 (46.87%)	4	12.5 %
1971	35	35	28 (80.0%)	11 (39.28%)	1	3.57%
1972	47	46	41 (89.1%)	16 (39.02%)	-	-
1973	47	43	37 (86.0%)	26 (70.27%)	-	-
1974	50	44	43 (97.7%)	33 (76.74%)	-	-
1975	40	39	35 (89.7%)	33 (94.28%)	-	-
1976	92	84	72 (85.7%)	72 (100.00%)	-	-
TOTAL	518	492	428	286	34	
1966-1971			200	106 (53.0 %)	34	17.0 %

% Students graduated high school: 94.98% (492/518)
% High school graduates entered college: 86.99% (428/492)
% Students currently attending or graduated college, 1966-1971: 53.0% (106/200)

TABLE II

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
FORMER STUDENTS

STUDENTS WHO WITHDREW FROM COLLEGE

Reasons Given For Withdrawal:

Poor Grades	32
Armed Services	7
Financial Difficulties	6
Personnal/Confidential	5
Lack of Interest	3
Obtained a Job	3
Marraige	2
Medical Problems	2
Deceased	2
Academic and Financial Problems	1
Family Problems	1
Illness in Family	1
Poor Preparation	1
Wanted to Pursue Main Interest (Radio Broadcasting)	1
Boredom/ Lack of Money	1
Reasons For Withdrawal Unknown	74
TOTAL	142

COLLEGE RETENTION AND ATTRITION SURVEY TABLE III

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, BY CLASS

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM, MARCH, 1976

YEAR GRAD HIGH SCHOOL	NO. STUDENTS IN PCSP CLASS	NO. STUDENTS STAFF UNABLE TO LOCATE FOR 2 OR MORE YEARS	% OF ORIGINAL PCSP CLASS IN STUDY
1966	39	10	74.4%
1967	38	19	50.0%
1968	53	22	58.5%
1969	39	15	61.6%
1970	36	9	75.0%
1971	35	14	60.0%
1972	47	15	68.0%
1973	47	13	72.3%
1974	50	5	90.0%
1975	40	0	100.0%
TOTAL	424	122	71.2%

NOTE: We were unable to locate 28.8% of the total student group.

Non-Upward Bound students, i.e., participants who were sponsored with non-Federal funds, are included in the above statistics.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Benjamin S. Bloom, Allison Davis, and Robert Hess, Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 37.

[2]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 162, "School Enrollment: October 1965" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 9, 10.

[3]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 190, "School Enrollment: October 1968 and 1967" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969), p. 11.

[4]Sar A. Levitan, Programs in Aid of the Poor in the 1970s (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1969), p. 81.

[5]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 286, "School Enrollment - Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1974" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 6.

[6]Telephone Interview with Frederick Sedorchuck, U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Postsecondary Education, Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination Section, Washington, D.C., 16 December 1976.

[7]David H. Stuart and Alvin M. Cruze, Estimates of the Target Populations for Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search Programs, Vol. II (Durham: Research Triangle Institute, 1975), p. 20.

[8]Robert G. Cope and William Hannah, Revolving College Doors (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975), pp. 1-3.

[9]Annabelle Fong et al., Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973), p. 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloom, Benjamin S.; Davis, Allison; and Hess, Robert. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Cope, Robert G., and Hannah, William. Revolving College Doors. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Crossland, Fred E. Minority Access to College. New York:Schocken Books, 1971.

Fong, Annabelle C. et al., Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.

Levitan, Sar A. Programs in Aid of the Poor for the 1970s. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 162, "School Enrollment: October 1965", U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 167, "School Enrollment: October 1966",U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 190, "School Enrollment: October 1968 and 1967", U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.,1969.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 286, "School Enrollment - Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1974", U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, "An Evaluation of Upward Bound: Findings and Conclusions", (Based on a study by Greenleigh Associates, 1970), Washington, D.C.: Evaluation Division, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1970.

Stuart, David H. and Cruze, Alvin M. Estimates of the Target Populations for Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search Programs. Vol. II. Durham: Research Triangle Institute, 1975.

Sedorchuck, Frederick. U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Postsecondary Education, Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination Section. Washington, D.C. Telephone Interview, 16 December 1976.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.	
1.	PCSP Students in Graduate Education	A-1	DELETED
2.	PCSP Students at Princeton University.....	A-4	DELETED
3.	System of Data Collection and Follow-up on Former Students.....	A-5	
4.	Data on Former Students Who Are Employed.....	A-11	
5.	Statistics, Class of 1966.....	A-14	
6.	Statistics, Class of 1967.....	A-19	
7.	Statistics, Class of 1968.....	A-25	
8.	Statistics, Class of 1969.....	A-32	
9.	Statistics, Class of 1970.....	A-37	
10.	Statistics, Class of 1971.....	A-43	
11.	Statistics, Class of 1972.....	A-49	
12.	Statistics, Class of 1973.....	A-54	
13.	Statistics, Class of 1974.....	A-64	
14.	Statistics, Class of 1975.....	A-70	

NOTE: Pages A-1 to A-4 have been deleted. These pages contained lists of student names.

SYSTEM OF DATA COLLECTION AND FOLLOW-UP
ON
FORMER STUDENTS

PCSP administrative staff have attempted to conduct intense follow-up on former students since the inception of the program in June, 1964. Prior to 1969, there was no formal system; but administrative staff, through personal contacts with students and college registrars, a healthy correspondence with students, and a grapevine that was something of an old boy network for the disadvantaged, managed to track all but a few students.

more

In 1969, a formal system was implemented and other than minor revisions of the questionnaires used, the system has remained the same. In January of each year since 1969 a questionnaire, Form A, was sent to the registrars of the colleges our students were presumed to be attending. Form B was sent to the last known address of students whom we knew, or subsequently learned, had withdrawn from college. Form C was sent to the registrar's office at college once we learned or suspected that a student had reentered or been readmitted to the college from which he had originally withdrawn. If we learned that a student transferred to another school we would send out a Form A with transfer status indicated. Form D was sent to college registrars to confirm an upperclassman's graduation and Form E was sent to former students who were known to have earned an undergraduate degree.

The last survey was conducted in January, 1976 and is the basis for this report.

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
204 Green Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

TO THE REGISTRAR:

The student listed below is a participant in our Upward Bound Program and according to our records is enrolled in your school. In order to keep our records current, we would appreciate it if you were to fill in the information requested and return it to us as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Earl P. Thomas
Director

COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. STUDENT'S NAME _____

2. SCHOOL _____ DATE OF ENTRY INTO COLLEGE _____

3. WHAT IS STUDENT'S PRESENT HOME ADDRESS _____

4. IS HE/SHE STILL ENROLLED? YES_____ NO _____

5. IF NOT STILL ENROLLED, WHY DID HE/SHE LEAVE? _____ WHEN _____

IF STILL ENROLLED, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

6. IS HE/SHE IN GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING? YES _____ NO _____

7. WHAT IS HIS/HER CURRENT CLASS? FRESH._____ SOPH._____ JR._____ SR._____

8. WHAT IS HIS/HER EXPECTED DATE OF GRADUATION? _____

9. WHAT IS HIS/HER COURSE OF STUDY? _____

10. IS HE/SHE RECEIVING SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE? YES _____ NO _____

11. WHAT IS HIS/HER PRESENT CAMPUS ADDRESS? _____

_____

12. ADDITIONAL NOTES OR COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
204 Green Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

TO FORMER PCSP STUDENTS:

We are currently conducting a survey of former PCSP students. We would appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire below and return it to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed.

Earl P. Thomas
Director

I. Name_____

Address_____

High School Attended_____

Date Graduated_____

Circle Highest Grade Completed:

High School		College				Graduate School			
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

II. If you are attending or have attended college, please complete:

College	Location of College	Dates Attended

Major Field of Study_____

Expected Date of Graduation_____

Current School Address_____

If you are not presently attending school, why did you leave? Do you plan to return?_____

III. If you are currently employed, please complete:

Employer_____

Business Address_____

Type Work_____

IV. Please use the back of this form for comments.

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
204 Green Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

TO THE REGISTRAR:

Our records show that the student listed below left school on the date indicated. We would appreciate it if you were to let us know if this student has been readmitted.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Earl P. Thomas
Director

COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. STUDENT'S NAME _____

2. SCHOOL _____ DATE OF ENTRY INTO COLLEGE _____

3. DATE OF WITHDRAWAL FROM SCHOOL _____

4. REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL _____

5. WHAT IS THE STUDENT'S PRESENT HOME ADDRESS? _____

_____

6. HAS STUDENT BEEN READMITTED? YES _____ NO _____

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 6 WAS YES, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

7. DATE OF READMISSION _____

8. IS HE/SHE IN GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING? YES _____ NO _____

9. WHAT IS HIS/HER CURRENT CLASS? FRESH.____ SOPH.____ JUNIOR____ SEN.____

10. WHAT IS HIS/HER EXPECTED DATE OF GRADUATION? _____

11. WHAT IS HIS/HER COURSE OF STUDY? _____

12. IS HE/SHE RECEIVING SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE? YES _____ NO _____

13. WHAT IS HIS/HER PRESENT CAMPUS ADDRESS? _____

_____

14. ADDITIONAL NOTES OR COMMENTS _____

_____

_____

_____

FORM D

A-9

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
204 Green Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

TO THE REGISTRAR:

The student listed below was a participant in our Upward Bound Program previous to his/her entry into college. According to our records, he/she was due to have been graduated in June, 197 . So that we may complete his/her record, we would appreciate it if you were to fill in the information requested.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Earl P. Thomas
Director

COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. STUDENT'S NAME _____

2. SCHOOL _____ DATE OF ENTRY _____

3. WHAT IS HIS/HER PRESENT MAILING ADDRESS? _____

_____

4. WHAT WAS/IS STUDENT'S COURSE OF STUDY IN COLLEGE? _____

5. HAS HE/SHE GRADUATED? YES____ NO____

6. IF YES, A. WHAT YEAR DID HE/SHE GRADUATE? _____

B. HAS HE/SHE GONE ON TO GRADUATE SCHOOL? YES____ NO____

IF YES, WHERE? _____

COURSE OF STUDY? _____

7. IF HE/SHE HAS NOT GRADUATED, IS HE/SHE STILL ENROLLED? YES____ NO____

8. IF NOT STILL ENROLLED, WHY DID HE/SHE LEAVE? _____

9. WHEN DID HE/SHE LEAVE? _____

IF STILL ENROLLED, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

10. IS HE/SHE IN GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING? YES____ NO____

11. WHAT IS HIS/HER CURRENT CLASS? FRESH.____ SOPH.____ JR.____ SR.____

12. WHAT IS HIS/HER EXPECTED DATE OF GRADUATION? _____

13. IS HE/SHE RECEIVING SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE? YES____ NO____

14. WHAT IS HIS/HER PRESENT CAMPUS ADDRESS? _____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, IF ANY, MAY BE WRITTEN ON BACK PAGE.

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
204 Green Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

TO FORMER PCSP STUDENTS:

We are currently conducting a survey of former PCSP students. Our records indicate that you have attended college and graduated. In order to update our records, we would appreciate it very much if you would complete the questionnaire below and return it to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Earl P. Thomas
Director

Name_____

Address_____

Phone_____

College Attended_____

Location of College_____
(City) (State)

Date Graduated_____

Degree Earned_____

Major Course of Study_____

If you have attended or are currently attending graduate school, please complete:

Graduate School_____

Dates Attended_____

Major Field of Study_____

Degree Earned_____

If you are currently employed, please complete:

Employer_____

Employer's Address_____

Type Work_____

Please include any comments that you may have:

_____

_____

DATA ON FORMER STUDENTS WHO ARE EMPLOYED

EMPLOYED FORMER STUDENTS

MARCH 1976

Occupational Classification

I. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers (35)

1. Accountants---------- 2
2. Actors, Entertainers---------- 1
3. Actuaries---------- 1
4. Chemists, Research---------- 1
5. Computer Specialists---------- 2
6. Consultants
   a. Communications---------- 1
   b. Education---------- 1
   c. Management---------- 1
7. Draftsmen---------- 1
8. Engineers---------- 6
9. Film Producers---------- 1
10. Financial Analysts---------- 2
11. Health Educators---------- 1
12. Radio Announcers---------- 1
13. Social Workers---------- 1
14. Teachers---------- 9
15. Vocational and Educational Counselors----- 3

II. Managers and Administrators (17)

1. Administrators, Education---------- 2
2. Bank Officers---------- 4
3. Hospital Administrators---------- 1
4. Insurance Coordinators---------- 1
5. Materials Manager---------- 1
6. Personnel Officers---------- 1
7. Proprietors (Grocery Store)---------- 1
8. Retail Store Manager---------- 1
9. School Administrator---------- 2
10. Social Work Administrator---------- 1
11. Administrators, Other---------- 2

III. Sales Workers (3)

1. Grocery Clerk---------- 1
2. Insurance Agents---------- 2

EMPLOYED FORMER STUDENTS

Page 2

IV. Clerical and Kindred Workers (13)

1. Accounting Clerks---------- 2
2. Bank Clerks---------- 2
3. Blueprinter---------- 1
4. Commisary Clerk---------- 1
5. Computer Operators---------- 2
6. Postal Clerks---------- 4
7. Reproduction Clerk---------- 1

V. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers (10)

1. Automobile Mechanic---------- 1
2. Carpenter---------- 1
3. Electrician, Apprentice---------- 1
4. Electronics Technician---------- 1
5. Foreman---------- 1
6. Machinist---------- 1
7. Printing Craftsmen---------- 2
8. Telephone Deskman---------- 1
9. Telephone Linesman---------- 1

VI. Operatives, except Transport (5)

1. Assemblers---------- 2
2. Machine Operatives---------- 3

VII. Transport Equipment Operatives (4)

1. Delivery Driver---------- 1
2. Forklift Operator---------- 1
3. Taxicab Driver---------- 1
4. Truck Driver---------- 1

VIII. Laborers (1)

1. Longshoreman---------- 1

IX. Service Workers (9)

1. Correction Officers---------- 2
2. Custodian---------- 1
3. Fireman---------- 1
4. Nurses' Aide---------- 1
5. Policeman---------- 1
6. Probation Officer---------- 1
7. Security Guard---------- 2

EMPLOYED FORMER STUDENTS

Page 3

X. Armed Services (20)

XI. Unemployed (2)

XII. Occupation Unknown (182)

XIII. Deceased (5)

Number Employed	Number Unemployed	Number Occupation Unknown	Number Deceased
117	2	182	5

TOTAL: 306

NOTE: Statistics do not include 122 full-time students.

CLASS OF 1966

CLASS OF 1966

Class Size: 39
Graduates, Not Upward Bound: 39

% Students Graduating From High School or Earning G.E.D.: 100% (39/39)

% Students Entering College: 92.3% (36/39)

% Students Attending College: 12.8% (5/39)

% Students Graduating From College: 43.6% (17/39)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 13.9% (5/36)

% Students Who Entered College That Have Graduated From College: 47.2% (17/36)

CLASS OF 1966

I. GRADUATES, NOT UPWARD BOUND (39)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (38)

Burlington	4
Henry Snyder	5
Malcolm X. Shabazz	5
Newark Central	5
Princeton	4
Trenton Central	10
Weequahic	5
Total	38

2. Earned G.E.D. (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (3)

2. Entered college (36)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Antioch C. (Ohio)	1		1	
Chabot College (Calif.)	T(1)	1		
Drexel Institute	1			T(1)
Duquene U.	1		1	
Fairleigh Dickinson Rutherford	1			1
Howard U.	2			1, T(2)
Jersey City State	T(3)	1		
Kean C.	5		3	2
Lincoln U. (Pa.)	2			1, T(3)
Mercer County C.C.	T(2)			1
Montclair State C.	T(5)			1
Morgan State C.	1			1
Princeton U.	3		3	
Rider C.	1			T(4)
Rutgers U.				
C. of Arts & Sciences At Camden	T(9)	1		
Livingston C.	T(7)		1	
Rutgers C.	9, T(4)	1	5	1,T(5),T(6), T(7)
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	1,T(6),T(8)	1	1	1
S.U.N.Y.				
Alfred	2			2
Fredonia	2			1, T(8)

CLASS OF 1966
Page 2

Colleges (cont.)	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Temple U.	1			T(9)
Trenton State C.	2		1	T(10)
U. of Wisconsin	T(10)		1	
Wesleyan U. (Conn.)	1			1
Total	36 10T	5	17	14 10T

b. Withdrawals (14)

Reasons for Withdrawals

Poor Grades------- 4
Deceased---------- 1
Unknown----------- 9

c. Areas of Concentration (still in college)

Business---------- 3
Political Science- 1
Urban Studies----- 1

d. Majors - College Graduates

Business---------- 1
Economics--------- 1
Education--------- 3
Fine Arts--------- 1
History----------- 3
Mathematics------- 1
Philosophy-------- 1
Political Science- 2
Psychology-------- 1
Theatre/Speech---- 1
Unknown----------- 2

e. Graduate Schools

Nine of our students entered Graduate School:

1. Columbia U., Teacher's College (counseling and Guidance) — M.A. 1973
2. Kean C. (Fine Arts) — Attended 9/74 - 12/75
3. Kean C. (Student Personnel Services) — M.A. 1972
4. Peabody Conservatory of Music

CLASS OF 1966
Page 3

Graduate Schools (cont.)

5.	Rutgers U., Livingston C. (City and Regional Planning and Urban Communications)	M.A. 1972
6.	Rutgers U. Law School	Attending
7.	Rutgers U., School of Education	M.A. 1975 Working Toward Ph.D.
8.	Rutgers U. Business School	M.B.A. 1972
9.	U. of Pittsburgh Business School	M.B.A. 1971

C. Employment

1. Students, Full-time---------- 2
2. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Accountant---------- 1
   b. College Counselor---------- 1
   c. Educational Consultant---------- 1
   d. Film Producer---------- 1
   e. Financial Analyst---------- 1
   f. Management Consultant---------- 1
   g. Teachers
      1. Junior-Senior H.S.---------- 2
      2. Conservatory---------- 1
   h. Traffice Engineer---------- 1
3. Managers and Administrators
   a. Administrator in Education---------- 1
   b. Bank Officer---------- 1
   c. Materials Manager---------- 1
   d. Personnel Manager---------- 1
   e. Retail Store Manager---------- 1
   f. Social Work Administrator---------- 1
4. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers
   a. Electronics Technician---------- 1
   b. Foreman---------- 1
5. Service Workers
   a. Policeman---------- 1
6. Armed Forces---------- 1
7. Deceased---------- 1
8. Unknown----------16

CLASS OF 1967

CLASS OF 1967

Class Size: 42
Upward Bound Graduates: 1
Graduates, Not Upward Bound: 37
Drops, Not Upward Bound: 4

The following figures do not include students dropped from the program:

% Students Graduating from High School or Earning G.E.D.: 100% (38/38)

% Students Entering College: 71% (27/38)

% Students Attending College: 10% (4/38)

% Students Graduating from College: 31.5% (12/38)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 14.8% (4/27)

% Students Who Entered College That Have Graduated From College: 44.4% (12/27)

CLASS OF 1967

I. U.B. GRADUATES (1)

A. High School

1. Earned G.E.D (1)

B. College

1. Entered college (1)

a. College	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Westminster C. (Mo.)	1			1

b. Withdrawals (1)

Reason for Withdrawal

Academic and Financial Problems----- 1

C. Employment

1. Sales Workers

a. Grocery Clerk-------- 1

II. GRADUATES, NOT UPWARD BOUND (37)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (37)

Arts	2
Benjamin Franklin (Philadelphia)	1
Burlington	5
East Side	3
Henry Snyder	2
Lincoln	4
Malcolm X. Shabazz	1
Newark Central	5
Phillips Exeter Academy (N.H.)	1
Trenton Central	5
Weequahic	2
West Side	6
Total	37

CLASS OF 1967
Page 2

B. College

1. Did not enter college (11)

2. Entered college (26)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Albion C.	1		1	
Amherst C.	1		1	
Antioch C. (Ohio)	1		1	
Bloomfield C.	1			1
Carnegie-Mellon U.	1		1	
Dickinson C.	1		1	
Essex County C.	T(3)			T(1)
Howard U.	1		1	
Jersey City State C.	T(5)	1		
Kean C.	2	1		1
Lincoln U. (Pa.)	2		1	T(2)
Princeton U.	3		1	2
Rutgers U.				
Rutgers C.	5		2	1,T(3),T(4)
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	T(2)			T(5)
St. Peter's C.	2, T(4)	1		2
S.U.N.Y., Fredonia	2		1	1
Washington & Lee U.	1		1	
William Patterson	T(1)	1		
Wilmington C.	2			2
Total	26 5T	4	12	10 5T

b. Withdrawals from College (10)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Confidential------- 1
Disenchanted------- 1
Poor grades-------- 4
Unknown------------ 4

c. Areas of Study (still in college)

Business------ 1
Education----- 1
Psychology---- 2

d. Majors - College Graduates

Biology---------- 1
Chemistry---------- 1
Communications----- 1
English---------- 1
Fine Arts---------- 1
History---------- 2
Political Science-- 2
Psychology--------- 1
Sociology---------- 2

e. Graduate School

Five of our students entered Graduate School:

1.	Fairleigh Dickinson U. (Finance)	M.B.A 1974
2.	Rutgers U. Medical School (Health Education)	Attending
3.	S.U.N.Y. at Binghamton (Sociology)	M.A. 1976
4.	U. of California/Irvine (Chemistry)	M.A. 1974
5.	Yale U. (American Studies)	Attending (Will earn Ph.D. in Sept'76)

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time---------- 3
2. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Research Chemist---------- 1
   b. Health Educator---------- 1
   c. Counselor---------- 1
   d. Entertainer, actor---------- 1
3. Managers and Administrators
   a. College Administrator---------- 1
   b. Bank Officers---------- 2
4. Clerical and Kindred Workers
   a. Computer Operator---------- 1
5. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers
   a. Telephone Deskman---------- 1
6. Transport Equipment Operatives
   a. Delivery Driver---------- 1
7. Laborers
   a. Longshoreman---------- 1
8. Deceased---------- 1
9. Unknown----------22

CLASS OF 1967
Page 4

III. DROPS, NOT UPWARD BOUND (4)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (1)

Rogers H.S. (Canton, Miss.)---------- 1

2. Did not graduate from high school (2)

3. Unknown (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (2)

2. Unknown (1)

3. Entered College (1)

a. College	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Michigan State U.	1		1	

b. Major

Math/Criminology---------- 1

c. Graduate School

Michigan State U. (Personnel Management) M.B.A 1972

C. Employment

1. Sales Workers
   a. Computer Sales-------- 1
2. Unknown------------------- 3

CLASS OF 1968

CLASS OF 1968

Class Size: 55
Upward Bound Graduates: 14
Upward Bound Drops: 1
Graduates, Not Upward Bound: 39
Drops, Not Upward Bound: 1

The following figures do not include students dropped from program:

% Students Graduating from High School: 92.4% (49/53)

% Students Entering College: 81.1% (43/53)

% Students Attending College: 5.6% (3/53)

% Students Graduating from College: 39.6% (21/53)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 7% (3/43)

% Students Who Entered College That Have Graduated From College: 48.8% (21/43)

CLASS OF 1968

I. U.B. GRADUATES (14)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (11)

Burlington---------- 3
East Side---------- 1
Hightstown---------- 1
Malcolm X. Shabazz----- 1
Newark Central--------- 1
Trenton Central-------- 1
West Side---------- 3

Total 11

2. Did not graduate from high school (3)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (3)

2. Entered college (11)

a. Colleges

	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Findlay C.	1			1
Lafayette C.	1		1	
Macalester C.	1		1	
N.J. Institute of Technology	1		1	
New York U.	1			1
Princeton U.	1		1	
Rider C.	1			1
Rutgers U.				
Rutgers C.	2		2	
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	1			1
Trenton State C.	1			1
Total	11		6	5

b. Withdrawals (5)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Poor Grades--------- 3
Unknown---------- 2

c. Majors - College Graduates

Engineering---------- 2
Environmental Studies--- 1
Mathematics/Economics--- 1
Psychology---------- 1
Unknown---------- 1

d. Graduate Schools

Three of our Upward Bound students entered Graduate School:

1. N.J. Institute of Technology (Engineering) — Attending
2. Rutgers Graduate School of Education (Early Childhood Education) — M.Ed. 1975
3. University of Chicago Business School (Finance/Accounting) — M.B.A. 1974

C. Employment

1. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Engineers
      1. Transportation---------- 1
      2. Application & Marketing---------- 1
   b. Teachers---------- 1
2. Managers and Administrators
   1. Bank Officer (Corporate Lending)---------- 1
3. Unknown----------10

II. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (1)

A. High School

1. Graduated high school (1)

Alden H.S. (Alabama)------- 1

B. College

1. Unknown---------- 1

C. Employment

1. Unknown---------- 1

CLASS OF 1968

III. GRADUATES, NOT UPWARD BOUND (39)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (38)

Arts	3
Burlington	3
East Side	2
Henry Snyder	4
Hightstown	5
Hoosac	1
Lincoln	3
Malcolm X. Shabazz	2
Newark Central	3
Trenton Central	3
Weequahic	4
West Side	5
Total	38

2. Did not graduate from high school (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (7)

2. Entered college (32)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Amherst C.	2		1	1[a]
Boston U.	1			1[b]
Bowdoin C.	1		1	
Bucknell U.	1			T(1)
Drake U.	1		1	
Essex County C.	1			1
Jersey City State C.	1			1
Kansas State U.	1			1
Kean C.	1			1
Lehigh U.	1		1	
Lincoln U. (Pa.)	1		1	
Mercer County C.C.	2	1		1
N.J. Institute of Technology	4, T(1)	1	2	2
Rutgers U.				
Cook C.	1		1	
University C.	T(2)	1		
C. of Arts & Sciences at Camden	1		1	
Rutgers C.	6		2	4
St. Peter's C.	1			T(2)

(a) Needs only 4 courses to graduate
(b) Needs only 1 course to graduate

CLASS OF 1968
Page 4

Colleges (cont.)	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
S.U.N.Y., Fredonia	1			1
Trinity C. (Conn.)	1		1	
Upsala C.	1		1	
Wesleyan U.	1		1	
Wilmington C.	1		1	
Total	32	3	15	14
	2T			2T

b. Withdrawals (14)

Reasons for Withdrawals

Job---------- 1
Personal Reasons--- 2
Poor Grades-------- 2
Unknown---------- 9

c. Areas of Study (still in college)

Business-------2
Engineering----1

d. Majors - College Graduates

Agriculture Business----- 1
Black Studies---------- 1
Economics-------------- 1
Engineering------------ 2
History---------------- 1
Journalism------------- 1
Mathematics------------ 1
Political Science------- 1
Sociology-------------- 2
Unknown---------------- 4

e. Graduate Schools

Six of our students entered Graduate School:

1. Drake U. (Public Administration and Urban Affairs) — Withdrew (Attended 12/72 - 6/73)

2. New York University Graduate School of Public Administration (Health Administration) — M.P.A. June 1975

3. Northwestern U. (Mathematics) — M.A. August 1973 Attending, working toward Ph.D.

Graduate Schools (cont.)

4.	Rutgers University Graduate School of Business	M.B.A. May 1976
5.	State University of New York at Buffalo (Law)	J.D. June 1975
6.	University of Massachusetts (Education)	Attended spring '76

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time---------- 2
2. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Financial Analyst---------- 1
   b. Communications Consultant---------- 1
   c. Engineers
      1. Chemical---------- 1
      2. Construction---------- 1
   d. Teachers---------- 2
3. Managers and Administrators
   a. Hospital Administration---------- 1
   b. School Administration---------- 1
   c. Other Administration---------- 1
   d. Proprietor (Grocery Store)---------- 1
4. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers
   a. Apprentice Electrician---------- 1
5. Operatives
   a. Assembler---------- 1
   b. Machinists---------- 2
6. Service Workers
   a. Fireman---------- 1
7. Armed Services---------- 2
8. Unknown----------20

IV. DROPS, NOT UPWARD BOUND (1)

A. High School

1. Unknown

B. College

1. Unknown

C. Employment

1. Unknown

CLASS OF 1969

CLASS OF 1969

Class Size: 40
Upward Bound Graduates: 39
Upward Bound Drops: 1

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops:

% Students Graduating from High School: 97.4% (38/39)

% Students Entering College: 87.2% (34/39)

% Students Attending College: 5.1% (2/39)

% Students Graduating from College (4 Year): 38.4% (15/39)

% Students Graduating from College (2 Year): 2.6% (1/39)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 5.8% (2/34)

% Students Who Entered College That Have Graduated From College (4 Year): 44.1% (15/34)

% Students Who Entered College That Have Graduated From College (2 Year): 2.9% (1/34)

CLASS OF 1969

I. U.B. GRADUATES (39)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (38)

Burlington---------- 4
East Side---------- 3
Henry Snyder---------- 1
Hightstown---------- 5
Irvington---------- 2
Lincoln---------- 2
Malcolm X. Shabazz------ 2
Newark Central---------- 7
Princeton---------- 1
Trenton Central--------- 3
Weequahic---------- 2
West Side---------- 6

2. Did not graduate from high school (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (5)

2. Entered college (34)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Antioch (Ohio)	1		1	
Bates C.	1		1	
Brown U.	1			T(1)
Burlington C.C.	1		1*	
Essex County C.C.	1, T(1)	1		1
Findlay C.	1			1
Fisk U.	1		1	
Fla. Institute of Technology	T(6)		1	
International C.	1			1
Jersey City State C.	1		1	
Kean C.	2			2
Mercer County C.C.	1, T(5)			2
N.J. Institute of Technology	T(3)	1		
Princeton U.	2		1	T(3)
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	1			1
Rutgers U.				
Livingston C.	3, T(4)		1	3
Rutgers C.	6		3	2, T(4)
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	1, T(2)			2
St. Peter's C.	2		2	
Stevens Institute of Technology	1		1	
Trenton State C.	1			T(5)
U. of Connecticut	1		1	

* Earned A.A.

CLASS OF 1969
Page 2

Colleges (cont.)	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
U. of Pennsylvania	1		1	
Upsala C.	2			1, T(6)
Washington U.	1			1
Total	34	2	15	16
	6T		1(AA)	6T

b. Withdrawals (16)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Family Problems----------1
Financial Difficulties-----1
Joined the Service---------1
Lack of Interest-----------1
Poor Grades----------------4
Unknown--------------------8

c. Areas of Study (still in college)

Mathematics----------1
Unknown---------------1

d. Majors - College Graduates

Biology----------------1
Business (4 yr.)-------2
Business (2 yr.)-------1
Communications---------1
Engineering------------1
English----------------1
History----------------1
Political Science------1
Psychology-------------1
Sociology--------------3
Unknown----------------3

e. Graduate Schools

Six of our students entered Graduate School:

1. Boston College Law School	Attending
2. Rutgers Medical School	Attending
3. Rutgers Graduate School (Community Relations)	Withdrew

CLASS OF 1969
Page 3

Graduate Schools (cont.)

4.	Rutgers Graduate School of Theatre Arts	Attending Part-time Non-matriculated
5.	Stevens Institute of Technology (Computer Sciences)	M.A. 1973
6.	Trenton State College (Student Personnel Service)	Attending

C. Employment

1. Students, Full-time---------- 3
2. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Auditor---------- 1
   b. Computer Specialists---------- 2
   c. Engineer---------- 1
   d. Teacher (Junior High)---------- 1
   e. Social Worker---------- 1
   f. Actuary---------- 1
3. Managers and Administrators
   a. Assistant Coordinator, Education---------- 1
4. Clerical and Kindred Workers
   a. Mail Handler---------- 1
5. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers
   a. Linesman---------- 1
   b. Automobile Mechanic---------- 1
6. Armed Services---------- 1
7. Unemployed---------- 1
8. Unknown----------23

II. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (1)

A. High School

1. Did not graduate from high school (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (1)

C. Employment

1. Unknown (1)

CLASS OF 1970

CLASS OF 1970

Class Size: 40
Upward Bound Graduates: 36
Upward Bound Drops: 2
Graduates, Not Upward Bound: 2

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops:

% Students Graduating from High School: 97.3% (37/38)

% Students Entering College: 84.2% (32/38)

% Students Attending College: 13.1% (5/38)

% Students Graduating from College: 26.3% (10/38)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 15.6% (5/32)

% Students Who Entered College That Have Graduated from College: 31.2% (10/32)

CLASS OF 1970

I. U.B. GRADUATES (36)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (36)

Burlington	5
East Side	5
Hightstown	6
Malcolm X. Shabazz	4
Newark Central	5
Trenton Central	4
Vailsburg	1
West Side	6
Total	36

B. College

1. Did not enter college (5)

2. Entered college (31)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
Antioch C. (Ohio)	1			1
Bates C.	1		1	
Durham Business School	1			1
Fordham U.	1		1	
Gettysburg C.	1		1	
Haverford C.	1		1	
Holy Cross C.	1		1	
Jersey City State C.	1			1
Kean C.	1			1
Macalester C.	2			2
Marietta C.	1		1	
Mercer County C.C.	1	1		
N.J. Institute of Technology	1			1
Pace C.	1			1
Princeton U.	2	1	1	
Reed C.	1		1	
Rider C.	1			1
Rutgers U.				
Newark Evening School	2	1		1
C. of Arts & Sciences at Camden	1			1
Livingston C.	T(1)			1
Rutgers C.	5	1	1	2, T(1)
Seton Hall U.	1			1
Syracuse U.	1		1	
Thomas A. Edison C.	1	1		
Washington U.	1			1
Total	31	5	10	16
	1T			1T

b. Withdrawals from college (16)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Financial Problems--- 2
Joined the Service--- 1
Poor Grades---------- 3
Unknown-------------10

c. Areas of Study (still in college)

Art---------- 2
Business---------- 1
Political Science---------- 1
Unknown---------- 1

d. Majors - College Graduates

Biology---------- 1
History---------- 3
Political Science---------- 2
Psychology---------- 3
Urban Studies and Criminal Justice--- 1

e. Graduate Schools

Four of our students entered Graduate School:

1. George Washington U., National Law Center	Attending
2. Trenton State College (Psychological Counseling)	Attending (M.A. expected 8/76)
3. Wake Forest U., Graduate School of Business (Student will attend Rutgers Graduate School of Business in fall '76 to complete work required for M.B.A.)	Attended 9/74 - 12/75
4. Medical School (Massachusetts)	Attending

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time---------- 5
2. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Draftsman---------- 1
   b. Counselor (Juvenile)---------- 1
   c. Teacher (Day-Care Center)---------- 1
3. Managers & Administrators
   a. Assistant Field Director---------- 1
   b. Coordinator, Insurance---------- 1
4. Sales Workers
   a. Insurance agent---------- 1

CLASS OF 1970
Page 3

Employment (cont.)

5. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers
   a. Printing Craftsman----------1
6. Transport Equipment Operatives
   a. Taxicab Driver----------1
7. Service Workers
   a. Security Guard----------1
   b. Probation Officer----------1
8. Armed Forces----------4
9. Unknown----------17

I. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (2)

A. High School

1. Graduated high school (1)

Wendell B. Laughbon (Washington)----1

2. Unknown (1)

B. College

1. Unknown (2)

C. Employment

1. Unknown (2)

II. GRADUATES, NOT UPWARD BOUND (2)

A. High School

1. Graduated high school (1)

West Side------- 1

2 Did not graduate high school (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (1)

2. Entered college (1)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Essex County C.	T		1
Wilberforce U.	1		T

b. Withdrawals (1)

Reason for Withdrawal

Not Interested-----1

C. Employment

1. Service Workers
   a. Security Guard----- 1
2. Unknown---------- 1

CLASS OF 1971

CLASS OF 1971

Class Size: 43
Upward Bound Graduates: 34
Upward Bound Drops: 8
Graduates, Not Upward Bound: 1

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops:

% Students Graduating from High School: 100% (35/35)

% Students Entering College: 80% (28/35)

% Students Attending College: 20% (7/35)

% Students Graduating from College: 11.4% (4/35)

% Students Who Entered College that Are Attending College: 25% (7/28)

% Students Who Entered College that Have Graduated from College: 14.3% (4/28)

CLASS OF 1971

I. U.B. GRADUATES (34)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (34)

Newark Central---- 7
Trenton Central---14
West Side---------13

Total 34

B. College

1. Did not enter college (7)

2. Entered college (27)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	Grad.	W/D
American U.	1			1
Doane C.	1			T(1)
Drew U.	1			1
Drexel U.	1			1
Earlham C.	1			1
Fairleigh Dickinson U.	1			T(2)
Findlay C.	2			2
Grambling C.	1	1		
Howard U.	1			1
Indiana State U.	T(3)	1		
Lehigh U.	1		1	
Mercer County C.C.	3,T(1),T(8),T(9)	2		2,T(3),T(4)
N.J. Institute of Technology	2			2
Rutgers U., Cook C.	T(2)			T(5)
University C.	T(6)	1		
Livingston C.	1,T(4),T(5)	1	1	1
Rutgers C.	3		1	1, T(6)
Newark C. of Arts and Sciences	2			1, T(7)
Trenton State C.	1			T(8)
U. of Evansville	T(7)	1		
U. of Pittsburgh	1			1
Westminster Choir C.	1			T(9)
Wilberforce U.	1			1
William Patterson C.	1		1	
Total	27 9T	7	4	16 9T

CLASS OF 1971
Page 2

b. Withdrawals from college (16)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Financial Problems	3
Illness in Family	1
Marriage	1
Medical	1
Personal	1
Poor Grades	3
Poor Preparation	1
Unknown	5

c. Areas of Study (still in school)

Drama	1
Humanities	1
Political Science	2
Visual Arts	2
Unknown	1

d. Majors - College Graduates

Communications	1
Economics	1
International Relations	1
Sociology	1

e. Graduate School (1)

Rutgers Graduate School of Social Work	Attending (M.S.W. expected Dec.'76)

C. Employment

1.	College Students, full-time	6
2.	Students, vocational training centers	2
3.	Clerical and Kindred Workers	
	a. Accounting Clerk	1
	b. Postal Clerk	1
	c. Reproduction Clerk	1
4.	Sales Workers	
	a. Insurance Agent	1
5.	Service Workers	
	a. Correction Officer	1
	b. Custodian	1
6.	Armed Services	2
7.	Unknown	18

CLASS OF 1971
Page 3

II. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (8)

A. High School

1. Graduated high school (3)

Barringer----------1
School in Puerto Rico-----1
West Side----------1

2. Did not graduate from high school (4)

3. Unknown (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (5)

2. Unknown (1)

3. Entered college (2)

a. Colleges

	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Rutgers U.			
Livingston C.	1		1
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	1		1
Total	2		2

b. Withdrawals from college (2)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Unknown----- 2

C. Employment

1. Transport Equipment Operator
   a. Truck Driver---------- 1
2. Unknown---------- 7

III. GRADUATES, NOT UPWARD BOUND (1)

A. High School

1. Graduated high school (1)

Trenton Central---- 1

CLASS OF 1971
Page 4

B. College

1. Entered college (1)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Mercer County C.C.	T		1
Seton Hall U.	1		T

b. Withdrawals (1)

Reason for Withdrawal

Unknown-------- 1

C. Employment

1. Unknown----- 1

CLASS OF 1972

CLASS OF 1972

Class Size: 55
Upward Bound Graduates: 47
Upward Bound Drops: 8

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops:

% Students Graduating from High School or Earning G.E.D.: 97.8% (46/47)

% Students Entering College: 87.2% (41/47)

% Students Attending College 34% (16/47)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 39% (16/41)

CLASS OF 1972

I. U.B. GRADUATES (47)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (45)

East Orange	1
Malcolm X. Shabazz	1
Newark Central	8
Trenton Central	15
Weequahic	5
West Side	15
Total	45

2. Earned G.E.D. (1)

3. Did not graduate from high school (1)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (6)

2. Entered college (41)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Belknap C.	1		T(1)
Bloomfield C.	1, T(6)		1, T(2)
Dickinson C. (Pa.)	1	1	
Drew U.	1		T(3)
Earlham C.	2	1	T(4)
Essex County C.C.	2,T(3),T(8)		3, T(5)
Fairleigh Dickinson U.			
Teaneck	T(11)	1	
Florham-Madison	2		2
Findlay C.	2		1, T(6)
Hawaii Pacific C.	T(9)	1	
Jersey City State C.	3	2	1
Kean C.	T(5),T(7)	1	1
Kentucky State C.	T(1)		1
Lincoln U. (Pa.)	1		1
Mercer County C.C.	3	1	2
Middlebury C.	1	1	
Monmouth C.	1	1	
Montclair State C.	3		2, T(7)
N.J. Institute of Technology	1		T(8)
Pratt Institute	1		1
Rider C.	3, T(4)		3, T(9)
Rutgers U.			
Livingston C.	5	3	2
Newark C. of Arts and Sciences	T(10)	1	

CLASS OF 1972
Page 2

Colleges (cont.)	Entered	Attend.	W/D
St. Vincent's C.	1		T(10)
Seton Hall U.	1		1
Shaw U.	1		1
Trenton State C.	2	1	1
Virginia State C.	1		1
Winston-Salem State U.	1		T(11)
Teterboro Aeronautics	T(2)	1	
Total	41 11T	16	25 11T

b. Withdrawals from college (25)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Deceased--------- 1
Job-------------- 1
Joined Service--- 5
Poor Grades------ 5
Unknown----------13

c. Areas of Study

Aviation---------- 1
Biology----------- 3
Business---------- 3
Criminal Justice----- 1
Engineering---------- 1
English----------- 1
Physical Education--- 1
Political Science---- 1
Psychology---------- 1
Sociology----------- 1
Urban Studies-------- 1
Unknown----------- 1

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time----------14
2. Clerical and kindred workers
   a. Commisary Clerk---------- 1
   b. Accounting Clerk---------- 1
   c. Postal Clerk---------- 1
   d. Computer Operator---------- 1
3. Operatives, except Transport
   a. Assembler---------- 1
4. Transport Equipment Operatives
   a. Fork-lift Operator---------- 1

CLASS OF 1972
Page 3

Employment (cont.)

5. Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers
   a. Substitute Teacher---------- 1
6. Armed Services---------- 5
7. Unemployed---------- 1
8. Deceased---------- 3
9. Unknown----------17

II. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (8)

A. High School

1. Graduated high school (1)

   West Side------- 1

2. Earned G.E.D. (1)

3. Did not graduate (3)

4. Unknown (3)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (3)

2. Unknown (4)

3. Entered college (1)

a. College	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Essex County C.C.	1	1	

b. Area of Study

   Psychology------ 1

C. Employment

1. Student, full-time---- 1
2. Armed Services-------- 2
3. Deceased---------- 1
4. Unknown---------- 4

CLASS OF 1973

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
Students in College: 1966-1975

SCHOOLS	ENT.	TRANSF. IN.	ATTEND.	GRAD.	W/D	TRANSF. OUT
Albion C.	1			1		
American U.	1				1	
Amherst C.	3			2	1	
Antioch C.	4			3	1	
Bates C.	2			2		
Belknap C.	1					1
Bloomfield C.	5	1	3		2	1
Boston U.	2		1		1	
Bowdoin C.	1			1		
Bowling Green State U.		1	1			
Brown U.	1					1
Bucknell U.	2					2
Burlington County C.C.	1			1		
Carnegie-Mellon U.	1			1		
Chabot C. (Calif.)		1	1			
Cornell U.	1		1			
Dickinson C.	2		1	1		
Doane C.	1					1
Drake U.	1			1		
Drew U.	10		7		2	1
Drexel Institute	2				1	1
Durham Business School	1				1	
Dusquene U.	1			1		
Earlham C.	11		8		2	1
East Stroudsburg State C.	1		1			

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
Page 2

SCHOOLS	ENT.	TRANSF. IN	ATTEND.	GRAD.	W/D	TRANSF. OUT
Essex County C.	10	5	6		7	2
Fairleigh Dickinson U.	6	1	3		3	1
Findlay C.	6				5	1
Fisk U.	2		1	1		
Florida Inst. of Tech.		1		1		
Fordham U.	1			1		
Gettysburg C.	1			1		
Grambling C.	1		1			
Haverford C.	1			1		
Hawaii Pacific C.		1	1			
College of the Holy Cross	1			1		
Holy Trinity Seminary	1		1			
Howard U.	4			1	2	1
Illinois State U.	1		1			
Indiana State U.		1	1			
International C.	1				1	
Jersey City State C.	6	2	4	1	3	
Kansas State U.	1				1	
Kean C.	17	2	4	3	11	1
Kentucky State C.	1	1			1	1
Lafayette C.	1			1		
Lehigh U.	3			2	1	
Lincoln U.	7		1	2	2	2
Macalester C.	3			1		2
Marietta C.	1			1		

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
Page 3

SCHOOLS	ENT.	TRANSF. IN.	ATTEND.	GRAD.	W/D	TRANSF. OUT
Mercer County C. C.	13	8	10		9	2
Miami-Dade C. C.	1		1			
Middlebury C.	3		2		1	
Monmouth C.	1		1			
Montlcair State C.	9*	1	2		4	1
Morgan State C.	1					1
New Jersey Inst. of Tech.	13	2	4	3	7	1
New York U.	1				1	
Pace C.	1				1	
Pratt Institute	2		1		1	
Princeton U.	13		2	7	2	2
Ramapo C.	2		2			
Reed C.	1			1		
Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.	1				1	
Rider C.	12	1	3		7	3
Rutgers U.						
Cook C.	1	1		1		1
C. of Arts & Sci. at Camden	2	1	1	1	1	
C. of Engineering	3		2		1	
Douglass C.	1		1			
Livingston C.	18	5	10	3	10	
Newark C. of Arts & Sci.	10	8	7	1	8	2
Rutgers C.	42	2	7	16	13	8
St. Peter's C.	5	1	1	2	2	1
St. Vincent's C.	1					1
Salem C.	1		1			
Seton Hall U.	6		1		4	1
Shaw U.	2				2	

* 3 students entered from class of 73 in 6/76.

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
Page 4

SCHOOLS	ENT.	TRANSF. IN	ATTEND.	GRAD.	W/D	TRANSF. OUT
State U. of New York						
Alfred	2				2	
Fredonia	5			1	3	1
Stevens Inst. of Tech.	1			1		
Stockton State C.	1		1			
Syracuse U.	1			1		
Temple U.	1					1
Teterboro Aeronautics		1	1			
Thomas A. Edison C.	1		1			
Trenton State C.	8		2	1	3	2
Trinity C.	2		1	1		
U. of Connecticut	1			1		
U. of Evansville	1	1	2			
U. of Minnesota	1		1			
U. of North Carolina		1	1			
U. of Pennsylvania	2		1	1		
U. of Pittsburgh	1				1	
U. of Wisconsin	1	1	1	1		
Upsala C.	11		8	1	1	1
Virginia State C.	1				1	
Washington & Lee U.	1			1		
Washington U.	2				2	
Wesleyan U.	2			1	1	
Westminster C. (Mo.)	1				1	
Westminster Choir C.	1				1	
Wilberforce U.	2				1	1

PRINCETON COOPERATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAM
Page 5

SCHOOLS	ENT.	TRANSF. IN	ATTEND.	GRAD.	W/D	TRANSF. OUT
William Patterson C.	1	1	1	1		
Wilmington C.	4			1	2	1
Winston-Salem State C.	1					1
TOTAL	354	52	131	80	143	52

CLASS OF 1973

Class Size: 52
Upward Bound Graduates: 47
Upward Bound Drops: 5

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops:

% Students Graduating from High School: 91.4% (43/47)

% Students Entering College: 70.2% (33/47)

% Students Still Attending College: 46.8% (22/47)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Still Attending College: 66.7% (22/33)

Note: Four students entered college in September, 1976

Revised Statistics:

% students entering college: 78.7% (37/47)
% students still attending college: 55.3% (26/47)
% students who entered college that are still attending college 70.2% (26/37)

CLASS OF 1973

I. U.B. GRADUATES (47)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (43)

Irvington	1
Little White Mountain (N.H.)	1
Newark Central	7
Trenton Central	11
Weequahic	1
West Side	22
Total	43

2. Did not graduate from high school (4)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (14) 3 students entered college 6/76. new total = 11.
2. Entered college (33) new total = 36.

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Bloomfield C.	1	1	
Cornell U.	1	1	
Drew U.	4	3	1
Earlham C.	1	1	
East Stroudsburg	1	1	
Essex County C.	1	1	
Fairleigh Dickinson Teaneck	1	1	
Illinois State U.	1	1	
Kean C.	3	1	1, T(1)
Mercer County C.C.	T(1)	1	
Pratt Institute	1	1	
Princeton U.	1	1	
Rider C.	2		1, T(2)
Rutgers U.			
School of Engineering	1		1
Livingston C.	3	2	1
Newark C. of Arts and Sciences	1		1
Rutgers C.	3, T(2)	2	2
Seton Hall	2		2
Shaw U.	1		1
Stockton State C.	1	1	
Trenton State C.	1	1	
U. of North Carolina	T(3)	1	
U. of Pennsylvania	1	1	
Wilmington C. (Ohio)	1		T(3)
Total	33	22	11
	3T		3T
Montclair State C. (ent. 6/76)	3	3 (add to total	
	39	25	

b. Withdrawals from College (11)

Reasons for Withdrawals

Job	1
Poor Grades	1
To Pursue Main Interest (Radio Broadcasting)	1
Unknown	8

c. Areas of Study

Art	2
Business	2
Chemistry	1
Communications	1
Computer Programming	2
Education	1
History	2
Political Science	1
Psychology	2
Sociology	4
Undecided/Unknown	4

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time	22
2. Professional, Technical and kindred workers	
a. Radio Announcer	1
3. Clerical and kindred workers	
a. Bank Teller	1
b. Mail Handler	1
4. Craftsmen and kindred workers	
a. Printer	1
b. Machinist (Drill Press Operator)	1
5. Service Workers	
a. Correction Officer	1
6. Armed Services	1
7. Unknown	18

CLASS OF 1973
Page 3

II. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (5)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (1)

Boulder H.S. (Colorado)---- 1

2. Earned G.E.D. (1)

3. Unknown (3)

B. College

1. Unknown (3)

2. Entered college (2)

a. Colleges

	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Bethume-Bookman C.	T(1)	1	
Rutgers U.			
Livingston C.	1		1
U. of Colorado	1		T(1)
Total	2	1	1
	1T		1T

b. Withdrawals (1)

Reason for Withdrawal

Unknown----- 1

c. Areas of Study

Psychology-- 1

C. Employment

1. Student, full-time----1
2. Unknown----------4

CLASS OF 1974

CLASS OF 1974

Class Size: 63
Upward Bound Graduates: 49
Graduates, Not Upward Bound: 1
Upward Bound Drops: 13

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops.

% Students graduated from high school: 88% (44/50)

% Students entered college: 86% (43/50)

% Students who entered college and are still in attendance: 76.7% (33/43)

CLASS OF 1974

I. U.B. GRADUATES (49)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (43)

Newark Central----- 6
Trenton Central----16
Weequahic---------- 1
West Side----------20

Total 43

2. Did not graduate from high school (6)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (8)

2. Entered college (41)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Boston U.	1	1	
Bowling Green State U.	T(1)	1	
Bucknell U.	1		T(3)
Drew U.	1	1	
Earlham C.	3	2	1
Essex County C.	4	3	1
Fisk U.	1	1	
Kean C.	1	1	
Kentucky State C.	1		T(1)
Lehigh U.	1		1
Lincoln U. (Pa.)	1	1	
Mercer County C.C.	T(2)	1	
Middlebury C.	2	1	1
Montclair State C.	3	2	1
N.J. Institute of Technology	3	1	2
Princeton U.	1		T(2)
Ramapo C.	2	2	
Rider C.	2	1	1
Rutgers U.			
School of Engineering	1	1	
Livingston C.	2	1	1
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	1, T(3)	1	1
Salem C. (W.V.)	1	1	
Seton Hall U.	1	1	
Trinity C. (Conn.)	1	1	
U. of Minnesota	1	1	
U. of Wisconsin	1	1	
Upsala C.	4	4	
Total	41 3T	31	10 3T

b. Withdrawals from College (10)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Boredom/Lack of Money---------- 1
Marriage---------- 1
Medical---------- 1
Personal Reasons---------- 1
Poor Grades---------- 3
Special Interest Courses(did not intend to pursue a degree)-- 1
Unknown---------- 2

c. Areas of Study

American Studies---- 1
Architecture-------- 1
Art/Music---------- 3
Biology---------- 2
Chemistry---------- 1
Education---------- 2
Engineering--------- 2
English---------- 1
History---------- 1
Human Relations----- 1
Humanities---------- 1
Medical Technology-- 2
Psychology---------- 1
Sociology---------- 3
Undecided/Unknown--- 9

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time----------30
2. Clerical & kindred workers
   a. Blueprinter---------- 1
   b. Bank Clerk---------- 1
3. Craftsmen & kindred workers
   a. Carpenter---------- 1
4. Operatives, except transport
   a. Factory worker---------- 1
5. Transport Equipment Operatives
   a. Truck driver---------- 1
6. Service Workers
   a. Nurses' Aide---------- 1
7. Armed Services---------- 3
8. Unknown----------10

CLASS OF 1974
Page 3

II. UPWARD BOUND DROPS (13)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (3)

Colegio Salesiano Leon XIII (Bogota, S.A.)-- 1
Trenton Central---------- 2

2. Did not graduate from high school (4)

One of these students is attending evening classes at Newark Central High School.

3. Unknown (6)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (4)

2. Unknown (7)

3. Entered college (2)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Mercer County C.C.	1		1
Universidad Distrital (Bogota)	1	1	

b. Withdrawals from college (1)

Reason for withdrawal

Unknown----------1

c. Area of Study

Engineering------1

C. Employment

1. Students, full-time---------- 1
2. Clerical & kindred workers
   a. Mail handler---------- 1
3. Craftsmen and kindred workers
   a. Furniture factory work------ 1
4. Service workers
   a. Porter---------- 1
5. Unknown---------- 9

CLASS OF 1974
Page 4

III. GRADUATES, NOT UPWARD BOUND (1)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (1)

West Side------- 1

B. College

1. Entered College (1)	Entered	Attend.	W/D
a. College			
Rutgers U. Livingston C.	1		1

b. Withdrawals from college (1)

Reason for withdrawal

Unknown------- 1

C. Employment

1. Unknown------- 1

CLASS OF 1975

CLASS OF 1975

Class Size: 54
Upward Bound Graduates: 40
Upward Bound Drops: 14

The following figures do not include Upward Bound Drops:

% Students Graduating from High School: 97.5% (39/40)

% Students Entering College: 87.5% (35/40)

% Students Attending College: 82.5% (33/40)

% Students Who Entered College That Are Attending College: 94.2% (33/35)

CLASS OF 1975

I. UPWARD BOUND GRADUATES (40)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (39)

Barringer---------- 1
Plainfield---------- 1
Trenton Central------20
West Side----------17

Total 39

2. Did not graduate from high school (1)

Student is attending Essex County College (Project Deep) in pursuit of G.E.D.

B. College

1. Did not enter college (5)

2. Entered college (35)

a. Colleges	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Bloomfield C.	2	2	
Drew U.	3	3	
Earlham C.	4	4	
Essex County C.	1	1	
Fairleigh Dickinson Teaneck	1	1	
Holy Trinity Seminary	1	1	
Kean C.	2		2
Mercer County C.C.	3	3	
Miami-Dade C.C.	1	1	
N.J. Institute of Technology	1	1	
Rider C.	2	2	
Rutgers U.			
C. of Engineering	1	1	
Douglass C.	1	1	
Livingston C.	3	3	
Newark C. of Arts & Sciences	1	1	
Rutgers C.	3	3	
U. of Evansville	1	1	
Upsala C.	4	4	
Total	35	33	2

CLASS OF 1975
Page 2

b. Withdrawals from College (2)

Reasons for Withdrawal

Unknown----------2

c. Areas of Study

Architecture---------1
Biology--------------1
Business-------------1
Chemistry------------1
Education------------2
English--------------1
Pre-Med--------------1
Sociology------------1
Undecided/Unknown---24

C. Employment

1. Students, Full-time-----33
2. Armed Services---------- 1
3. Unknown---------- 6

II. Upward Bound Drops (14)

A. High School

1. Graduated from high school (3)

Central Evening School----- 1
John Marshall (Virginia)--- 1
West Side----------- 1

2. Did not graduate from high school (4)

3. Unknown (7)

B. College

1. Did not enter college (5)

2. Unknown (8)

3. Entered College (1)

a. College	Entered	Attend.	W/D
Rutgers U. Livingston C.	1	1	

b. Areas of Study

Psychology-------- 1

C. Employment

1. Student, full-time---------- 1
2. Clerical and kindred workers
   a. Stock clerk---------- 1
3. Craftsmen and kindred workers
   a. Metal Craftsman---------- 1
4. Armed Services---------- 2
5. Unknown---------- 9